#### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

# 1. Status of the claims

Claims 16 and 17 are amended and claims 40-41 are added. Claims 15-17, 23-26 and 31-40 are currently pending with entry of the Amendment.

Support for the amendments can be found in originally-filed claims 12-14. No new matter is added.

# 2. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 16 and 17 were rejected as indefinite for depending from canceled claims and for lack of antecedent basis. As amended, dependency is corrected and proper antecedent basis is provided. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

### 3. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 15-16, 23-26, 31-35 and 38-39 were rejected as allegedly obvious over Lowe et al. in view of Meijerink et al. The Examiner argued that Lowe et al. described a number of the steps of the claimed invention, but did not disclose "determining the efficiency of an amplification by determining a non-linear continuously differentiable function of a logarithm of copy number." See, Office Action, page 4. For the latter proposition, the Examiner cited Meijerink et al., which the Examiner argued could be combined with the teachings of Lowe et al. In addition, claims 17 and 36-37 were rejected as allegedly obvious in view of Lowe et al., Meijerink et al. and Wittwer et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Meijerink et al. is not prior art to the present application. According to the first page of Meijerink et al., the reference was published in May 2001. The filing date of the present application is March 30, 2001, i.e., about a month before Meijerink et al. was published. Therefore, Meijerink et al. is **not** a proper reference to cite against the present claims.

Moreover, the Examiner is reminded that the present application claims priority to two German patent applications and a European patent application. The European application

Appl. No. 09/823,712 Amdt. dated October 19, 2004 Reply to Office Action of August 10, 2004

(00 107 036.6) was filed on March 31, **2000**. Thus, the claims have a priority date more than a year before the publication of Meijerink *et al*.

Since the Meijerink *et al.* reference is not prior art to the present application, and each rejection made by the Examiner relies on Meijerink *et al.*, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

# **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew E. Hinsch Reg. No. 47,651

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP

Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor San Francisco, California 94111-3834

Tel: 415-576-0200 Fax: 415-576-0300

Attachments MEH:meh 60330989 v1